App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1937-37
(23)

File No. 91/37
Serial No. 1

Letter References.

P-6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial No. 1

Part B- for IV m. 1937

SUBJECT.

Question of insurance of Government Buildings in the State

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—23-8-36

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

The general question raised seems to be one to be dealt with in the Public Works and Financial Secretariats. (It seems to have been raised previously and the view expressed that Govt. buildings need not ordinarily be insured the Govt. Piers building is, I believe, insured as a special case)

If approved this may be referred to the P. W. Secretariat for favour early needful action (or a note).

Submd
C.S.O.
21.9.37

M.O. No. 214
22-9-37

Yes The progress of the case may be watched & the P.W.D Secty requested to intimate what action may have been taken early

Bo 11/9 ruled

MS
21/9

22-9-37

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

No. D. 457

CB. 91 37-1

PUBLIC WORKS SECRETARIAT

Flag 5

DEWAN'S OFFICE
2931

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT
U.O.No. Fi. 416/A
23 OCT. 1937
BANGALORE

Un-official file dated 21st September 1937 received from the Chief Secretariat regarding the question of insurance of Government buildings in the State.

THROUGH THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

Submitted to the Dewan of Mysore.

2. No Government buildings in this State have so far been insured except a portion of the Bangalore Government Press. On enquiry the Chief Engineer for Roads and Buildings, Madras P.W.D. has replied that the buildings and stores of the Madras Government Press and Stationery Depot at Madras are not insured with any fire insurance company.

It does not seem necessary to insure the "Lalithamanal".

Flag A.

I agree with the P.W. Secy

25/10

Ch Secy w/c for opinion

25/10

a measure of General policy it does not seem Expedient to insure Govt. buildings. Apart from the question of cost involved it involves a sense of insecurity in the Govt. itself which cannot be the case when Govt. themselves take the best security against damage and loss. I am not aware that any other Govt. adopts the course of insuring

Ag. Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

Camp: Mysore,
26th October 1937.

TSRN.

Is it worthwhile against loss. Insurance
Generally speaking that protection is needed
for a limited time. This would be almost
in the case of individuals and private
concerns whose interests are limited by
time. In the case of Govt. its existence
is unlimited & subject to limitations. Its best
insurance is the way in which arrangements
are made for the protection of property
against human & conceivable dangers -
the chances of which should be reduced thereby.

(Chd) 9.11.37

DEWAN'S OFFICE
19 NOV. 1937
No. 3308.

OFFICE OF THE
FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
NOV 9 19
No

I agree

11/11

(Secy PWD) 12/11

Secy to LWC.

D 431
9.11.37.

18/11/37

Chief Secy

For perusal

19/11

Dewan)

19
19-11-37

22/11

Subject

Reference is invited to Sir Charles Todhunter's D.O. letters dated 16.9.1937 to the Dewan and the latter's reply.

Whether the papers need be sent to P.S. to HH for perusal and return, is for orders.

VS.
22/11

Not necessary
23/11

G-H 232

C 275

20 SEP. 1937
No. 24-349

Vasantha Mahal
Mysore
16th September 1937

My dear Mirza,

I think I ought to report to you that there was a small fire at Lalitha Mahal, which was discovered at about 7-30 p.m. yesterday. It occurred in one of the turret-rooms and one almirah was completely ruined, together with other fittings of the room.

So far we have only been able to conjecture the cause namely, that one of the servants left a beedi smouldering in the room. Fortunately the room was shut and this resulted in the fire burning itself out.

The incident seems to have some bearing on the question of insurance, which was recently raised by the Assistant Engineer, Headquarter Range, Mysore, at the instance of the Superintending Engineer, Mysore Circle. I have not yet replied to the letter in that behalf because my impression is that I had already raised the question and received orders that insurance of Government buildings was not expedient.

Yours sincerely,

SNK.